



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Satires and Epistles of Horace. Edited, with Notes, by J. B. GREENOUGH.
9 + 306 pp. 12mo. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1888.

There is certainly novelty about this edition, and it is shown in several ways. The notes are at the bottom of the page, contrary to the usual custom in England and this country. They are placed there to "facilitate reference," as the editor says. There is in general a complete absence of discussion of disputed points, very few grammatical remarks, no reference to other commentators, and no attempt to assign dates for the composition of the poems. The impression produced on one who carefully reads the notes is that of superficiality. The editor seems in a certain way to have striven for this result, that is, he has avoided any display of erudition and any thorough explanation of difficult questions. He intends "not so much to aid the student in the study of the Latin language as in the study of Horace." In very many places the notes show great excellence in suggesting the train of ideas and in stimulating the mind of the student, but on the whole they are disappointing. The reviewer has used the book with a class of average freshmen in their second term, and feels that while the general thought has been quite satisfactorily explained, details are continually passed over without comment. The instructor's time has frequently been taken up in explaining points which ought to have been treated in the notes. There are many words and usages in Horace which are enigmas to the average college student, and which he cannot be expected to ferret out himself. Now, a helpful hint or word of explanation in such places is just what notes are for, and for lack of that hint the student misses the idea of a whole sentence. The impression produced on the student's mind by this book is that there is no need of entering into details, and all he wants is a general idea of what is being talked about. The notes are simply a running commentary of what most naturally occurs to one reading for his own entertainment, very little more. The editor has made no attempt to add anything to what had previously been done by Horatian scholars, and, in fact, the notes seem to show that he has not cared to consult some of the recent commentators at all; for instance, it is hard to see how some of his statements could have been made if he had read Schütz's excellent edition. In reading over the notes on the Satires, the following places have been noted where revision is probably needed:

I 1, 15. By the editor's rendering of the words '*En ego, dicat, iam faciam quod vultis*,' proper attention is not called to the fact that the words '*en ego*' form a separate exclamation and idea, and are not to be taken immediately with *faciam*.

I 1, 17. The note on *mutatis discedite partibus* reads as follows: "*mutatis, changing*. The perf. part. is often best rendered by our present, which the

Latin lacks." This would seem to imply that the Latin has no pres. act. part. What the editor apparently means is that there is no proper pres. pass. part. in Latin, but *changing* being act. in English, the sense of the note is wholly obscured.

I 1, 32. In the note on *congesta cibaria*, it would be well to note the fact that *cibaria* means here the smallest possible amount on which they could live, and in this idea lies one of the principal points of the sentence.

I 1, 38. The alternative reading for *sapiens* is *patiens*. Of this the editor says: "*patiens*, which is very old, would mean *contented*, not greedy for more; cf. II 6, 91." This meaning for *patiens* may be supported by Fritzsche's "in aller Gemüthlichkeit," but is certainly wrong. Fritzsche quotes, to support his rendering, Serenus Sammonicus de medic. VI 82, but there we find *patiens laborum*. The passage referred to in this note, II 6, 91, *prærupti nemoris patientem vivere dorso*, gives us a case of *patiens* used in the same sense as in Ode I 7, 10 and Sat. II 5, 43, i. e. "steadfast, patient, enduring," but none of the authorities take it in the sense of "*contented*." In the present passage plainly refers to the patient endurance of the ant through the long winter.

I 1, 42. There is no hint in this note that *furtim* should be taken with *defossa* and *timidum* with *deponere*.

I 1, 50. "*Viventi*, the usual construction, is genitive, but it may be that the colloquial or popular construction was dative." There are only three cases of the gen. with *referre* in classical Latin, viz. Sall. Jug. III, *illorum retulisse*, and twice in Livy, *ipsorum referre*, 34, 27, and 40, 34. So that very likely we should hardly be justified in calling it the "usual construction." It is hard to see how any evidence that the dative was a colloquial construction can be drawn from this passage, for the dative can easily be explained on other grounds.

I 1, 71. The note on *indormis inhians* reads as follows: "*inhians*, *gloating*, i. e. with his mouth open, staring at them in admiration, as if he would like to eat them, and continuing his enjoyment of them till he falls asleep." Where is there any idea of "eating" implied? The gaping of admiration has nothing to do with the manifestation of any desire to eat. The meaning is that even in sleep the miser appears full of avarice, and the time of the action of *inhians* does not simply precede that of *indormis*, but accompanies it.

I 3, 91. *Catillum Evandri manibus tritum*. "There are two possible explanations of this name, either as a famous potter, in which case the dish is valuable for its intrinsic excellence; or as the ancient king, in which case there is a humorous indication of its age. The second seems the better." Why should the first be allowed as a possibility even? The "famous potter" of this name was brought to Rome as a prisoner some years after this satire was written. It is true that an artist by this name is mentioned twice by Cicero (ad fam. 7, 23, 1, and 2, 13, 2), but supposing that the anachronism might be disposed of in this way, it is exceedingly difficult and harsh to take *tritum* here in the sense of *tornatum*. It sometimes means "polished," but hardly "shaped." The first alternative does violence to the language and spoils the force of the passage.

I 3, 130. "*Alfenus*: no doubt a side hit at a rich usurer, probably, who had once been a cobbler said to be from Cremona, now dead." This Alfenus, who was said to have been a cobbler at Cremona, became one of the most celebrated *iuris consulti* at Rome, but there is no authority for the statement that

he was a "usurer." The adj. is regularly applied to the law and lawyers; cf. II 2, 31, *vafri incitia iuris*. *Sutor erat* does not necessarily imply that he was dead at this time.

I 4, 22. In the notes on *delatis capsis et imagine* and *nemo*, the editor implies that his view of the passage is that the writings and bust of Fannius were presented to him by his admirers. But the weight of evidence seems to be in favor of the other view. *Utro* must refer to Fannius himself, as no one else has been spoken of in the sentence, and *delatis* here has the usual meaning of *deferre*—to carry to the shop for sale—as in Ep. II 1, 269; I 12, 23. This explains Horace's remark in v. 71, *nulla taberna meos habeat neque pila libellos*. *Beatus* is then used in the same way as in Ep. II 2, 108.

I 4, 94. *Capitolini-Petilli*. "Petillius is so called (i. e. Capitolinus) in derision on account of his stealing gold from the statue of Jupiter on the Capitol." Now, this is no more than a supposition based probably on jokes of Plautus (Men. 941 and Trin. 83). The name Petillius Capitolinus is found on two coins, which might be brought forward as evidence to show that the name was originally given on account of some connection with the Capitol, but it certainly seems to have been a regular surname of the *gens Petillia*. This could hardly have arisen from a theft committed in the Capitol. The weight of evidence is against the statement of the notes.

I 5. In the introductory note the editor says that the satire may refer to either of Maecenas' journeys, the one in 40 B. C. or that in 37 B. C. Now, Schütz has proved conclusively that it cannot refer to that in 40 B. C., and equally conclusively, we think, that it refers to a journey taken in 38 B. C., and not in 37 B. C. To ignore this proof so completely is certainly wrong.

I 5, 46. In the note on *parochi* the editor remarks: "It may be that they were in this case bound to supply only certain articles, the travellers bringing the rest, or the words *ligna salemque* may mean entertainment generally, with a hint at its meagerness." But by the Lex Julia de Repetundis, B. C. 59, the articles furnished to state travellers were restricted to hay, salt, fire-wood, and beds.

I 5, 87. Would it not be well to mention that there is a strong probability that the town "*quod versu dicere non est*" is Herdonea, and not Equos Tuticus?

I 6, 72. The note on *magni Quo pueri magnis e centurionibus orti* reads thus: "*magni—magnis*, both referring to size, but perhaps with a reference to their excess of muscle over brain." This last seems far-fetched. Besides the allusion to bodily size, the evident reference is to the assumption of high rank and the arrogance of the centurions, who in a military colony would doubtless be among the "leading citizens."

I 6, 109. "*lasanum*, his kettle for cooking his meals along the road." The only other occurrence of this word in Latin is in Petronius 41, where Trimalchio "*ad lasanum surrexit*" from the table, and where the meaning is plainly just what the Scholiast explains it to be in this passage—" *vas in quo exoneratur venter*." The Greek word *λάσανα* is used once or twice in the plural where it is explained as a "pot," but eight times at least where it means "nightstool," and *λασανοφόρος*, Plut. 2, 182 c, certainly refers to this meaning. Therefore, in view of this fact and the passage quoted from Petronius, there seems to be no good reason for changing the meaning here.

I 7, 2. "*hybrida*, son of a Greek father and Roman mother." So the Scholiast, but is it not probable that the reverse is here true? The word *hybrida* is defined by Lewis as the "son of a Roman father and Greek mother." The name Persius is Latin. The probabilities of the case are in favor of the latter definition being the true one here. *Graecus* (v. 32) may easily be explained by the fact that Persius would learn the language of his mother in his Greek home, and hence the antithesis with *Italo aceto* (v. 32). At least this is just as likely as the other view, and should be stated as an alternative.

I 8, 25. "*Sagana majore*: there seems no reason why the natural meaning of the 'elder of two Saganas,' both sorceresses, should not be taken." The assumption of a younger sister is pure assumption, and is not the "natural" method of interpretation to make *maiore* refer to Canidia? There are arguments, of course, for both views, but is that of the editor the most "natural" one?

I 9, 36. *vadato*: "a plaintiff in a lawsuit." The editor evidently takes *vadato* here as a dative after *respondere*, but it seems much better to take it as an abl. abs. (cf. *testato*, *intestato*, etc.) equivalent to *vadimonio dato*, as *respondere* in its technical legal sense is never found with the dative, but is used absolutely.

I 9, 49. "*domus*: of Maecenas." This should read "*hac*: of Maecenas"; *domus* refers to any other house.

I 10, 37. "*defingit*: muddles: i. e. by describing it badly, using no doubt the epithet *luteum*.—*caput*: probably the mouth, but it may mean the source. The former seems more likely on account of *luteum*." This explanation is self-contradictory and misses the point. It is necessary to take *caput* as the source, and not the mouth, in order to carry out the idea of *defingit*, and to show the fault of applying *luteum* to the source of a river at all! That is just where the point of the line lies, and it is wholly lost by rendering *caput* mouth. The editor hints at the true meaning in his remark on *defingit*, and then contradicts it in the next clause.

I 10, 86. "*Bibule, Servi, Furni*: otherwise unknown." Now it is almost certain that Bibulus was L. Calpurnius Bibulus, third son of M. Cal. Bibulus, Caesar's colleague. His two brothers were killed in Egypt. He himself was known to Horace in Athens in 45 B. C., surrendered after Philippi, and died in Syria about the time of the battle of Actium. Also that Furnius was Caius Furnius, consul in 17 B. C., who died before his father, to whom pardon had been granted after Actium, at the request of this son; cf. Dio Cass. 52, 42; 54, 5. Also there is strong probability that Servius was the son of Servius Sulpicius Rufus, consul in B. C. 51, and the one who is praised by Cicero, ad fam. IV 3, 4, and 4, 5. See Schütz, note loc. cit.

I 10, 86. *Simul his*. "*his*: dative following *simul* by an imitation of the Greek *ἀμα* and an extension of words of nearness and likeness." *His* is abl., not dat., as Prof. Greenough himself says in his grammar, ¶ 261b; cf. Roby 2121, and Sil. 5, 417, *Avulsa est nam protinus hosti ore simul cervix*. It is an imitation of *ἀμα* and the dat. in Greek, but abl. in Latin.

II 1, 7. *verum nequeo dormire*. "*dormire*: this word at once indicates that it is Horace's nature to write so long as he is awake, thus making it an imperative necessity." How any one could get this idea out of the text is a mystery.

The clause means simply that when Horace has the inclination to write, he cannot sleep until he has relieved his mind. The editor's exegesis here has been aptly compared to some of Düntzer's notes on Goethe.

II 2. In the introductory note the statement is made that "the discourse is put into the mouth of a farmer, one of Horace's neighbors, named Ofellus." It is difficult to see how one can read Schütz's remarks on this point and continue to hold this old view.

II 3, 2. "*membranam poscas*: for engrossing a new finished composition." Is not the phrase *culpantur frustra calami* (v. 7), together with *raro scribis* (v. 1) and *retexens* (v. 2), and the impression of the whole passage, some evidence that the original writing of the satires is referred to?

II 3, 4. *Nil dignum sermone canas*. "*dignum sermone*: worth talking about"; the traditional interpretation, but the use of *canas*, which is only applied elsewhere to lyrical productions, the whole tenor of Damasippus' remarks, and the disparaging allusion to *poemata* (v. 321), seem to show that there is probably the idea of "nothing worthy of satire."

II 3, 28-30. There are strong arguments in favor of attributing these lines to Horace instead of Damasippus, to our mind convincing, but they have been wholly ignored by our editor.

II 3, 57. "*amica*: with *mater*." Schütz has a long note to show that this is probably not the case, and seems to have established his position.

II 3, 72. "*malis ridentem alienis*: laughing at his creditor's expense; the allusion is to Hom. Od. XX 347, though the sense there is a forced laugh." Now the plain inference from this note is that the principal idea of the phrase is to laugh at another's expense, whereas that is the secondary meaning; *alienis ridere malis* means to laugh in an *unnatural* manner, here by restraining the natural impulse and laughing in a subdued manner. The difference then between the passage in the Odyssey and this is that in the Greek the laughter is forced, here checked; in both cases unnatural.

II 3, 98. "*hoc*: the glory of being rich." Rather his riches themselves which he hoped would be productive of glory (*speravit magnae laudi fore*), or else the engraving of their amount on his tombstone.

II 3, 181. "*intestabilis*: *incapable of inheriting*, with other legal disabilities." This, of course, is true, but the first and well-nigh universal use of the word is in the active sense, meaning "incapable of making a will or acting as witness," which is clearly the meaning here.

II 3, 233. "*aequus*: *honest*, not wishing to take without payment, nor without appreciation of their services." That this cannot be the idea at all, and that *aequus* is used *ironically*, is evident from the tone of the whole passage.

II 3, 238. "*unde*: *whose*, lit. from whom, equal to a *quo*, the obliging husband." The youth is talking to the *leno*, and *uxor* is not used in the sense of *wife* of this *leno*, but in the sense of *meretrix*, whom the youth euphemistically calls *uxor*. Hence there is no propriety in the English rendering "obliging husband."

II 4, 18. "*responset*: *suit*, as answering the demands of the palate." Rather "defy," as in II 7, 85 and 103, and Ep. 1, 1, 68.

II 4, 24. "*Aufidius*, an unknown epicure." But there is some considerable

probability that this was M. Aufidius Lurco (Plin. h. n. X 20, 45), who obtained great wealth from the fattening of peacocks.

II 5, 95. *multum similis metuenti*. "*multum*: apparently colloquial in this sense; cf. I, 3, 57 (*multum demissus*), where its connection with a participle is more regular." But here it is to be taken not with *metuenti*, but with *similis*; cf. v. 80, *quantum studiosa*; II 3, 147, *multum celer*; and Ep. I, 10, 3, *multum dissimiles*.

II 5, 100. *certum vigilans*. "*certum*: sharply, so as to be perfectly sure of your aim." This is rather a mixture of metaphors. *Certum vigilans* means "keeping wide awake"; the opposite idea is expressed by Ovid (Her. 10, 9) *incertum vigilans*, "in a half-asleep condition."

II 6, 2. "*jugis*: either with *aquae* or *fons*. The latter would follow the favorite interlocked order, but cf. Ep. I, 15, 16." This reference, where *iugis* must agree with *aquae*, and the proper meaning of *iugis* (from *iungo*, *iugerum*), shut out any possibility of the other construction.

II 6, 98. "*levis*: i. e. gladly." There is no need of forcing an improbable meaning on to *levis* here. If it means anything more than "nimble," it is doubtless "fickle, easily influenced," as in the parallel cases II 7, 29 and 38.

II 6, 112. "*valvarum*, etc.: i. e. when the work of the day begins." This is the explanation usually given, but Schütz pertinently remarks, "Würden dann die Hunde bellen? Es kommt ein Fremder"; and quotes the Greek, ἡνοιξέ τις τὴν θύραν, Aes. fab. 297; ἀνέφξε τὴν θύραν τις, Babr. 108, 21.

A few misprints in the Satires have been noted. On p. 3, the note on l. 18 is put down as on 17. In the note on II 2, 29, the reference should be Ep. I, 1, 81, not I, 1, 181. In the note on II 3, 110, "cf. I, 3, 71," should read cf. I, 1, 71. In the note on II 3, 184 read v. 165 instead of 164. Line 326 of Sat. II 3 should be attributed to Horace, not to Damasippus; also in Sat. II 8 the last half of l. 4 and l. 5 should be attributed to Horace, not to Fundanius.

In conclusion we wish to say that in spite of its faults this is the best available American edition for college work.

SAMUEL BALL PLATNER.

Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache, von FRIEDRICH KLUGE. 4te verbesserte Auflage. Strassburg, 1889.

The first edition of this work appeared in 1883. The intervening editions, the second and third, were not mere reprints, but gave evidence of the constant care of the editor in slight additions, and especially in the prunings to which several articles were subjected. In the present edition, a few of the entries are entirely new, and a vast number of articles have been wholly or in part rewritten. The same excellences characterize this as the previous editions. Ample evidence of accuracy in phonetic deduction is forthcoming on every page. But the editor aims also at strict sequence in the development of meanings. This conservatism begets at once in the reader a feeling of confidence, which the entire absence of a direct display of learning in the explanations still further strengthens. The two-fold conscientiousness referred to above is remarkable and is continued through the whole book. Keeping